



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,130	06/27/2003	Kai O. Ulrich	13911-079001 / 2003P00155	6685
32864	7590	06/23/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			BERGER, AUBREY H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/609,130	ULLRICH, KAI O.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aubrey H. Berger	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-18 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 15 recites the limitation "the second portal content component" in line 3.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-3, 6, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Patterson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0053023, hereinafter "Patterson".

Regarding claim 1, Patterson discloses computer-implemented method of providing content in a portal (fig. 4, #80 and ¶[0048], lines 1-3), the method comprising: receiving a request from a user for a portal content component (fig. 7, #S1 and ¶[0055]); and determining whether the user has satisfied a previous authentication requirement for the portal that is equal to or greater than an authentication requirement for the portal content component (fig. 7, #S3-S4).

Regarding claim 2, Patterson further discloses if the previous authentication requirement is less than the authentication requirement for the portal content component, providing an authentication mechanism according to the authentication requirement for the portal content component (fig. 7, #S6-S8 and fig. 9, #S20-S21).

Regarding claim 3, Patterson further discloses if the previous authentication requirement is equal to or greater than the authentication requirement for the portal content component, displaying the requested portal content component (fig. 8A-B, #S10-S12).

Regarding claim 6, Patterson further discloses displaying a logon component of the authentication mechanism (¶[0021]).

Regarding claim 18, Patterson discloses system for providing content in a portal (fig. 4, #80 and ¶[0048], lines 1-3), the system comprising. a portal content directory (fig. 4, #84

& #86 and ¶[0045]) storing a plurality of portal content components, each portal content component having an authentication requirement for access thereto; a portal runtime engine for receiving portal content component requests and for displaying one or more requested portal content components (fig. 4, #82 & #80); and an authenticator/validation system (fig. 4, #80) configured to determine whether the user has satisfied a previous authentication requirement for the portal that is equal to or greater than an authentication requirement for a requested portal content component (fig. 7, #S1-S9).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4-5 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Busboom et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication, 2006/0053296, hereinafter Busboom.

Regarding claim 4, Patterson discloses the method in accordance with claim 1 but Patterson lacks or does not expressly disclose wherein each authentication requirement is defined by a weight. However, Busboom discloses wherein each authentication requirement is defined by a weight (¶[0109]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of

Patterson with the device of Busboom to define a strength or priority to the authentication requirements in order to define a particular level of security according to the service provider as taught by Busboom (§[0109]).

Regarding claim 5, Busboom further discloses comparing the weight of the previous authentication requirement with the weight of the authentication requirement for the portal content component (§[0027]).

Claims 16 and 17 are substantially equivalent to claims 4 and 5 and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

9. Claims 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson and further in view of Busboom.

Regarding claim 7, Patterson discloses a computer-implemented method of providing content in a portal (fig. 4, #80 and §[0048], lines 1-3), the method comprising: receiving a request from a user to access the portal; and in response to the request (fig. 7, #S1 and §[0055]). Patterson lacks or does not expressly disclose providing a selected one of a plurality of authentication mechanisms for authenticating the user and enabling access to the portal; wherein each authentication mechanism includes a different authentication requirement. However, Busboom discloses providing a selected one of a plurality of authentication mechanisms for authenticating the user and enabling access

Art Unit: 2134

to the portal, wherein each authentication mechanism includes a different authentication requirement (¶[0129] and ¶[0146]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Patterson with the device of Busboom to provide a plurality of authentication mechanism for authenticating the user to heighten security as taught by Busboom (¶[0146]).

Regarding claim 8, Busboom further discloses wherein each authentication requirement corresponds to at least one portal content component (¶[0146]).

Regarding claim 10, Patterson further discloses receiving a request from the user for a first portal content component (fig. 7, #S1); and determining whether the user has satisfied a previous authentication requirement for the portal that is equal to or greater than an authentication requirement for the first portal content component (fig. 7, #S2-S4).

Regarding claim 11, Patterson further discloses if the previous authentication requirement is less than the authentication requirement for the first portal content component, providing an authentication mechanism according to the authentication requirement for the first portal content component (fig. 7, #S6-S8 and fig. 9, #S20-S21).

Regarding claim 12 Patterson further discloses if the previous authentication requirement is equal to or greater than the authentication requirement for the first portal content component, displaying the first portal content component (¶[0021]).

Regarding claim 13, Patterson lacks or does not expressly disclose receiving a request from the user for a second portal content component; and determining whether the authentication requirement for the first portal content component is equal to or greater than an authentication requirement for the second portal content component. However, Busboom discloses receiving a request from the user for a second portal content component (fig. 10, #102a); and determining whether the authentication requirement for the first portal content component is equal to or greater than an authentication requirement for the second portal content component (fig. 10, #102b). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the device of Patterson with the device of Busboom to access a second portal content and require further authentication as a heightened security measure, as taught by Busboom (¶[0146]).

Regarding claim 14, Busboom further discloses if the authentication requirement for the first portal content component is less than the authentication requirement for the second portal content component, providing an authentication mechanism according to the authentication requirement for the second portal content component (fig. 10, #103b).



Regarding claim 15, Busboom further discloses if the authentication requirement for the first portal content component is equal to or greater than the authentication requirement for the second portal content component, displaying the second portal content component (¶[0146], lines 14-17, and fig. 10, "continuation of service session").

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson in view of Busboom as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Watanabe, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0084289.

Regarding claim 9, Patterson in view of Busboom disclose the method in accordance with claim 8, but lack or do not expressly disclose providing the user an option for selecting one of the plurality of authentication mechanisms. However, Watanabe discloses providing the user an option for selecting one of the plurality of authentication mechanisms (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Patterson in view of Busboom with the device of Watanabe to allow the user to select on of a plurality of authentication mechanisms in order to allow the user to be authenticated without causing an authentication error by a specific authentication process, as taught by Watanabe (¶[0011]).

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aubrey H. Berger whose telephone number is (571)272-8155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, and alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis-Jacques can be reached on (571)272-6962. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AHB

*Jacques H. Louis-Jacques*  
JACQUES H. LOUIS-JACQUES  
PRIMARY EXAMINER